

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

App. No.: 10/538,221
Applicant(s): Ray Burke et al.
Filing Date: June 9, 2005
Title: CONDUCTIVE POLYMER DEVICE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURING SAME
Art Unit: 2832
Examiner: Baisa, Joselito Sasis
Docket No.: P-0205-PCT-PA

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Restriction/Election Requirement set forth in the Office Action mailed June 20, 2007, Applicant elects “Embodiment 1,” shown in Figs. 1-11. Claims 16-28, 32, and 33 read on Embodiment 1. This election is made with traverse, as explained below.

Applicant also elects the claims in Group I (claims 16-28, 32, and 33, directed to “Embodiment 1”, and claims 55-66, 70, and 71, directed to “Embodiment 2”). This election is made without traverse.

The requirement to elect between “Embodiment 1” (Fig. 1-11) and “Embodiment 2” (Figs. 12-19) is respectfully traversed, on the grounds that the subject matter of Figs. 1-11, on the one hand, and the subject matter of Figs. 12-19, on the other hand, are so closely related that they do not constitute two separate and distinct species. Furthermore, the grouping of the Figures between a first “embodiment” in Figs. 1-11 and a second “embodiment” of Figs. 12-19 is respectfully submitted to be based upon a misunderstanding of these Figures.

Specifically, Figures 1-8 illustrate the steps in forming a matrix of electronic devices of the present invention from a laminated sheet. Only that portion of the matrix that would com-

prise a single device upon completion of the manufacturing process (that is, after singulation from the matrix), is illustrated in these Figures for the sake of clarity. Figures 9-11 illustrate three different embodiments of the finished device that may be formed from the matrix after singulation therefrom. Thus, each of Figs. 9-11 illustrates both a part of a matrix of devices, and a single device. See, e.g., Paragraph 0097 of US Patent Application Publication 2006/0055501 A1. Thus, the only difference between the claims directed to a “device” and the claims directed to a “matrix” of devices is that the latter constitutes a plurality of devices before singulation.

Figure 12 merely illustrates a package in which a plurality of devices (such as those illustrated in Figs. 9-11) may be combined. See Paragraphs 0073 and 0108 of US 2006/0055501, *supra*.

Fig. 13 merely illustrates a single in-line package (SIP) configuration for any of the devices illustrated in Figs. 9-11. See Paragraphs 0074 and 0110 of US 2006/0055501, *supra*.

Figs. 14 and 15 illustrate an exemplary circuit in which any of the devices of Figs. 9-11 may be used. See Paragraphs 0075, 0076, 0112, and 0113 of US 2006/0055501, *supra*. There are no claims directed to this exemplary circuit.

Thus, it can be seen that Figs. 1-11 illustrate the same invention, both before singulation (Figs. 1-8) and after singulation (Figs. 9-11), while Figs. 12-15 illustrate practical implementations of the same invention.

Figs. 16-18 illustrate a matrix from which a “quasi-multilayer” form of the device of the present invention may be made, while Fig. 19 illustrates a singulated device made from the matrix of Figs. 16-18. Thus, Figs. 16-18 have the same relationship to Fig. 19 that Figs. 1-8 have to Figs. 9-11, as discussed above. More specifically, as described at Paragraph 0115 of US 2006/0055501, *supra*, Figures 16-18 show a matrix of devices similar to that shown in Fig. 9 (actually, a “quasi-multilayer” variant thereof) at several steps in the process of manufacturing the devices, with Fig. 19 illustrating a singulated device formed in the matrix of Figs. 16-18.

Thus, while Figs. 9-11 and 19 show variants of the singulated device, they are all produced in a matrix of a plurality of unsingulated devices, as shown in Figs. 1-8 and 16-18. Therefore, these figures do not illustrate separate and distinct inventive concepts. Likewise, Figs. 12-15 merely illustrate implementations of the device of the invention, and thus do not illustrate separate inventive concepts.

Therefore, in summary, it is respectfully submitted that restriction of the drawing figures and the claims into two "embodiments," as set forth in the office action, is improper, and withdrawal of the restriction/election requirement, insofar as it requires election between these two "embodiments" is respectfully requested. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claims 16-28, 32, 33, 55-66, 70, and 71 be examined on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,



Howard J. Klein
Registration No. 28,727

Date: July 19, 2007

Klein, O'Neill & Singh, LLP (Customer No.: 22145)
43 Corporate Park, Suite 204
Irvine, California 92606
Tel: (949) 955-1920
Fax: (949) 955 1921